



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
10/667,287	09/19/2003	Junichi Rekimoto	112857-434	8626	
7590 05/03/2006		EXAMINER			
Bell, Boyd & Lloyd, LLC			HUYNH, BA		
P.O. Box 1135 Chicago, IL 60690-1135			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
5go, 12 00000 1100			2179		
			DATE MAILED: 05/03/2006		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

- <del>-</del>		Application No.	Applicant(s)					
Office Action Summary		10/667,287	REKIMOTO, JUN	REKIMOTO, JUNICHI				
		Examiner	Art Unit					
	<u> </u>	Ba Huynh	2179					
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication or Reply	appears on the cover shee	t with the correspondence a	ddress				
WHIC - Exte after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RECHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING nsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFI SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication poor period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory per preceived by the Office later than three months after the med patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ODATE OF THIS COMMUR 1.136(a). In no event, however, mand it.  Triod will apply and will expire SIX (6) If atute, cause the application to become	INICATION. y a reply be timely filed  MONTHS from the mailing date of this of a BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).					
Status								
1)[7	Responsive to communication(s) filed on _							
2a)□		This action is non-final.						
3)□	<b>,-</b>							
·	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Dispositi	ion of Claims							
4)🖂	4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-6</u> is/are pending in the application.							
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.							
	5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.							
6)⊠	☐ Claim(s) <u>1-6</u> is/are rejected.							
7)								
8)□	8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.							
Applicati	on Papers							
9)[	The specification is objected to by the Exam	niner.						
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.								
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).								
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).								
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.								
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119							
a)[	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fore  All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority docum  2. Certified copies of the priority docum  3. Copies of the certified copies of the papplication from the International Bursee the attached detailed Office action for a	ents have been received. ents have been received in priority documents have be reau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	n Application No. <u>10/06/99</u> . en received in this National					
2) 🔲 Notic 3) 🔯 Inforn	k(s) e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/ r No(s)/Mail Date	Paper N	ow Summary (PTO-413) No(s)/Mail Date of Informal Patent Application (PTo	O-152)				

Application/Control Number: 10/667,287

Art Unit: 2179

## **DETAILED ACTION**

## **Double Patenting**

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-6 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-22 of U.S. Patent No. 6,636,249. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because both set of claims are directed to the same subject matter and the broaden scope of the pending claims 1-6 are read-on by the patent claims.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Art Unit: 2179

Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The phrase "said surrounding context <u>and</u> time information" lacks clear antecedent basis.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by US patent #6,175,343 (Michell et al).

- As for claims 1, 6: Mitchell et al (hereinafter Michell) teach a computer implemented method and corresponding apparatus for dynamically attaching data items to physical environment, the steps/means for: capturing surrounding contexts including location level

Application/Control Number: 10/667,287

Art Unit: 2179

context and other level context (5:54-60, step 1315), wherein the location level context and other level context are sensed by different types of sensing means (11:1-2\_; receiving input data item from said surrounding contexts; and attaching said data item to said surrounding contexts (6:64-7:8, step 1335).

- As for claim 2: Data item are registered as being related to said surrounding contexts (10:7-25).
- As for claim 3: The data item related to said surrounding contexts and time information are designated to future or past time (5:44-46, 9:19-25).
- As for claim 4: The other level context is object level context (5:60-6:13).
- As for claim 5: The capturing step is continuously performed so that surrounding contexts are always captured (10:60-11:7).

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

US6,307,556 (Ellenby et al) see descriptions of figures 9-11.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ba Huynh whose telephone number is (571) 272-4138. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Weilun Lo can be reached on 571-272-4847. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/667,287

Art Unit: 2179

Page 5

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Ba Huynh

**Primary Examiner** 

AU 2179 4/30/06

BAHUYNH PHIMARY EXAMINER